DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 606 EA 004 193

AUTHOR Wiener, William K.
TITLE Interpersonal Compatibilities of Innovative and Non-Innovative School Principals and Curriculum Coordinators.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (57th, Chicago, Illinois, April 3-7, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Coordinators; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; *Educational Research; Group Dynamics; *Individual Characteristics; *Interpersonal Relationship; Interprofessional Relationship; *Principals; Speeches

ABSTRACT

A study was made to ascertain whether the relationship between the principal and the curriculum coordinator can be considered a variable related to the successful adoption of innovations in schools. A procedure for selection of innovative and noninnovative schools in making use of Miles' (1964) typology of innovation in education was tested. Principal-curriculum coordinator interpersonal compatibilities were ascertained from FIRO-B scores (Schutz, 1958) and comparisons on innovative/noninnovative principal-curriculum coordinator compatibility were made on 16 compatibility dimensions. Findings indicated significantly greater innovative principal-curriculum coordinator compatibility in areas where control and power were issues. This suggests some implications for the selection and subsequent prerogatives of innovative principals. (Author)

ED 061606

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INTERPERSONAL COMPATIBILITIES OF INNOVATIVE AND NON-INNOVATIVE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND CURRICULUM COORDINATORS [1]

By

William K. Wiener

Lenoir Rhyne College

Hickory, North Carolina

EA 004 193

[1] Prepared for presentation at the 1972 Convention of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois

A key word describing education during the past and present decades is change. The parade of educational innovations that was witnessed during the 1960's gave schools across the nation the disquieting feeling that what had been gospel in the classroom for years was now open to question. Educators examined problems ranging from curriculum relevance and why children fail to the egg-crate concept of school architecture. They prescribed cures of team teaching, non-gradedness, and open schools to "meet the needs of the individual youngster".

The mandate for change in education came from a variety of sources. The general public demanded an increased emphasis on the natural sciences and mathematics as well as more concentration on the humanities. Students made demands on the educational system to make curriculum relevant. The federal and state governments joined the fray to change education by pouring large amounts of money into education on all levels under the auspices of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

It seems safe to assume that the majority of schools in this country have attempted to change or innovate some phase of their educational program. However, a relatively unexplored area in the process of innovation is concerned with the kinds of human situations associated with the success or failure of the adoption of innovations in schools.

The basic question underlying this study was:

> Is the quality of the interpersonal relationship between the principal and the curriculum coordinator (the individual attached to the central office staff

of a school district who is responsible for the development of curriculum and the supervision of teachers) a variable that is related to the successful adoption of innovations in elementary schools?

The relationship between dyadic compatibility and productivity has been established by Schutz (1958), Moos and Speisman (1962), and Hutcherson (1963). Sopolsky (1965) and Gassner (1968) supported a relationship between compatibility and an individual's preference of another for continued personal interchange. These relationships suggested that the higher the compatibility between the curriculum coordinator and the principal, the easier it would be for them to work together, the better their problem-solving abilities and communications, and the more open each would be to the other's influence.

The compatibility of a dyad or group may be ascertained from scores on the FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior) -- an instrument designed by Schutz (1958) to measure interpersonal needs in the areas of expressed and wanted inclusion, control and affection.

Schutz (p. 59) briefly defines these needs as the following:

Expressed Inclusion - I initiate interaction with people.

Wanted Inclusion - I want to be included by others.

Expressed Control - I control people.

Wanted Control - I want people to control me.

Expressed Affection - I act close and personal toward people.

Wanted Affection - I want people to be close and personal with me.

According to Schutz (1958), the Area or total compatibility of two individuals is composed of three components: Interchange Compatibility, Originator Compatibility, and Reciprocal Compatibility.

Interchange Compatibility is based upon the similarity of needs of two individuals. Originator Compatibility measures the degree to which the individual needs are complementary, while Reciprocal Compatibility is an indication of the degree to which one individual's expressed behavior matches another's wanted behavior. The Area Compatibility indices represent the sum of the three types of compatibility on each need and on the overall dimension.

An investigation of the relationship between the principals and their curriculum coordinators seemed to be a feasible avenue to follow to learn more about factors related to school innovations. Within the professional bereaucratic framework (Wittes, 1970) under which most schools are organized, it would seem that most of the information about innovations would be disseminated by the curriculum coordinator to the principals. The relationship between these two individuals seemed to provide a basis for examining a variable that may be related to the successful adoption of educational innovations.

Three medium size school districts agreed to participate in the study. Each district had a minimum of six elementary schools and the principals of these schools had been in their present positions for two or more years.

The selection of innovative and non-innovative elementary schools was based upon three variables: information gathered from a descriptive survey completed by the principals, an analysis of school and district newsletters, and a School Activities Survey where central office personnel were asked to rank (1,2,3) the schools in their district according to their perception of the degree to which specific activities had taken place.

On the School Activities Survey (SAS), respondents were asked to consider each activity within the framework of a two-to-three year period. This time limit was included to guide the respondent toward inclusion of current and on-going activities, rather than activities initiated shortly before the administration of the instrument or those which have been in effect for a number of years.

Miles' (1964) typology of innovations provided the framework for SAS items. Although Miles' (1964) makes note of eleven categories of innovative activity, consideration of innovations involving physical facilities was omitted from this study as it was felt that modification of the physical plant of a school or the use of educational hardware are district-wide rather than school induced innovations.

SAS items were constructed to collect data about the following activities:

1. Boundary Maintenance Operations

   The extent to which a school has expanded or inducted personnel through the boundaries of the system is examined

by this item. The SAS asks for a rating of schools concerning the use of aides and volunteers in the instructional program.

2. Size and Territoriality

Activities extending or decreasing the system's boundaries are explored by this item. In terms of the individual school, this category has been interpreted as providing different classes to meet student needs. For example, smaller classes for under-or overachievers.

3. Time Use

Any change in the time a school is functional or variations in time usage are considered in this category. The SAS item examines time use from the aspect of scheduling changes from a self-contained situation.

4. Goals

This item elicits information about shifts in emphasis for certain areas of the curriculum and the introduction of new teaching methodologies.

5. Procedures

Information about any changes in the time, personnel, and activities relationship to improve goal attainment is acquired through this item.

6. Role Definition

Changes in permitted and prohibited behavior of the members of the system are examined by this item. More precisely,

respondents were asked if there had been any attempt to change the role of the classroom teacher from the self-contained generalist.

7. Normative Beliefs and Sentiment

Change in the norms of the system fall into this category. Relative to the school, this item was addressed to eliciting evidence of a change in atmosphere toward increased experimentation in the classroom and a change in the relationship among teachers from isolation to sharing information and activities. Such changes would indicate a shift from the norms of mandated curriculum structure and closed, self-contained isolationism.

8. Structure

This category is concerned with the reorganization of relationships among groups in the system. The item elicits information concerning change in the organizational pattern of a school. An example is the establishment of a curriculum council or a principal's cabinet for decision-making.

9. Socialization

Any change in how the system trains new entrants falls into this category. The SAS item asked about changes in individual school orientation programs for new teachers.

10. Linkage with Other Systems

Changes in the way the system related to its environment are included in this category. This item was geared to examine the usage of outside resources to enhance the educational

program of the school.

A tally sheet was prepared for scoring the respondents' rankings of the schools in their dictrict. Each school ranked first in either the 'most' or 'least' categories received three points. The second and third ranked schools received two or one point respectively. Following the entry of each response on the tally sheet, the 'most' and 'least' points were totalled. The two schools scoring highest in the 'most' category were selected as innovative schools. The two schools receiving highest scores on the 'least' dimension were chosen to be the non-innovative schools in the district. Thus, the sample was composed of twelve schools: two innovative and two non-innovative schools in each of the three districts.

An analysis of the descriptive survey completed by the principals and the school and district newsletters confirmed the results of the School Activities Survey.

Following the selection process, the principals in the sample schools and their curriculum coordinators were administered the FIRO-B.

The compatibility indices were derived by combining FIRO-B scores of each principal and his curriculum coordinator. Sixteen indices were considered in this study: Inclusion, Control, Affection, and Overall Compatibilities in each area of Interchange, Originator, Reciprocal and Area Compatibility.

It was hypothesized that a relationship would exist between principal-curriculum coordinator interpersonal compatibility and perceived successful innovations in the schools. More specifically, it was hypothesized that a greater compatibility would exist between the curriculum coordinator and principals of innovative schools than the curriculum coordinators and principals of non-innovative schools on all components of Area, Interchange, Originator and Reciprocal Compatibility.

The result of the tests performed on the data may be more meaningful if a comparison is made between the FIRO-B scores of the innovative and non-innovative principals and the normative FIRO-B data for school administrators (Schutz, 1967). Table 1 serves this purpose

TABLE 1

Comparative Data for FIRO-B Scores of Innovative and Non-Innovative Principals with Normative Data

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	INNOVATIVE N=6 MEAN	INNOVATIVE N=6 S.D.	NON-INNOVATIVE N=6 MEAN	NON-INNOVATIVE N=6 S.D.	NORMATIVE DATA MEAN	NORMATIVE DATA S.D.
Expressed Inclusion	4.1666	1.6749	4.0000	3.1091	5.9	1.90
Wanted Inclusion	1.6666	1.8856	3.3333	3.5900	4.6	3.41
Expressed Control	6.0000	1.0000	1.8333	2.0344	4.7	2.42
Wanted Control	3.3333	1.3743	4.0000	2.1602	5.5	1.72
Expressed Affection	3.3333	2.0547	3.8333	2.0344	4.4	2.28
Wanted Affection	4.1665	2.4776	4.0000	2.7688	5.1	2.54

On all dimensions, with the exception of expressed control, the mean FIRO-B scores of all the principals in the sample fell below the norm. The salient differences between the innovative and non-innovative principals and the normative data is on the dimension of expressed control. Here, the scores of the non-innovative principals indicate extremely low needs to express control, while the innovative principals indicate considerably higher needs in this area.

The four main compatibility indices which were considered highlight the differences between the scores of the innovative and non-innovative principals on the expressed control dimension especially in the areas of Originator Control, overall Originator Compatibility and Reciprocal Control Compatibility.

Comparisons between innovative/non-innovative principal-curriculum coordinator compatibility were made through the application of one tail t-tests.

The comparisons of innovative and non-innovative principals and their curricular coordinators on the dimensions of Area Compatibility and Interchange Compatibility indicated that no relationship existed at or above the .05 level of significance.

Table 2 includes an analysis of the components of Originator Compatibility (oK) in each of the three need areas and the overall Originator Compatibility index.

On the Control dimension (oK^c), the non-innovative principals' mean originator compatibility with the curriculum coordinator was -3.333, while innovative principals and the curriculum coordinator had an index

of 2.333 on this dimension. A comparison yielded a t-value of 2.384, which is significant above the .025 level.

The total Originator Compatibility index (oK) for innovative principals and the curriculum coordinator was 4.0000 and the compatibility for the non-innovative principals and the curriculum coordinator was -2.8333. This yielded a t-value of 1.8510 which is above the .05 level of significance.

Although the total Originator Compatibility index between each category of principal and the curriculum coordinator were significantly different, the mean scores indicate a greater Originator Compatibility between the non-innovative principal and the curriculum coordinator.

TABLE 2

Comparison of Innovative and Non-Innovative Schools
With Regard to Principal-Curriculum Coordinator
Originator Compatibility (oK)

	INNOVATIVE N=6		NON-INNOVATIVE N=6			
DEPENDENT VARIABLE	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	t	Level of Sig.
Originator Compatibility Inclusion(oK^I)	3.5000	2.5000	1.6666	3.0368	1.0422	N.S.
Originator Compatibility Control (oK^C)	2.3333	3.8586	-3.3333	3.7712	2.3484	<.025
Originator Compatibility Affection(oK^A)	-1.8333	4.1799	-1.1666	1.2133	.3425	N.S.
Originator Compatibility (oK)	4.0000	5.7734	-2.8333	5.8996	1.8510	<.05

An analysis of the factors comprising Reciprocal Compatibility (rK), as well as an overall reciprocal compatibility index is included in Table 3.

Examination of Table 3 suggests a greater compatibility between the curriculum coordinator and the innovative principal on the reciprocal compatibility control dimension (rK^C). The mean for innovative principal-curriculum coordinator reciprocal compatibility was 4.0000 and the non-innovative-curriculum coordinator index on this dimension was 8.5000. A comparison of the two means yielded a t-value of 2.7644 which is significant at the .01 level on the control Reciprocal Compatibility dimension.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Innovative and Non-Innovative Schools With Regard to Principal-Curriculum Coordinator Reciprocal Compatibility (rK)

	INNOVATIVE N=6		NON-INNOVATIVE N=6			
DEPENDENT VARIABLE	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	t	Level of sig.
Reciprocal Compatibility Inclusion (rK^I)	7.1666	2.7938	5.3333	4.5704	.7653	N.S.
Reciprocal Compatibility Control (rK^C)	4.0000	2.6457	8.5000	2.5000	2.7644	.01
Reciprocal Compatibility Affection (rK^A)	6.8333	5.1774	6.5000	3.4520	.1197	N.S.
Reciprocal Compatibility (rK)	18.0000	7.0710	20.3333	6.9201	.5273	N.S.

In summary, the analysis of the data indicated significant differences on the Originator Compatibility Control dimension and on the overall Originator Compatibility Index. On the Control dimension, innovative principals seemed to be more comfortable with the curriculum coordinator, while the total Originator Compatibility Index indicated the opposite. An analysis of Reciprocal Compatibility indices indicated significantly greater innovative principal-curricular coordinator compatibility on the control dimension.

With regard to questions of interpersonal compatibility, the results seemed to indicate that no relationship existed between compatibilities of principals in innovative and non-innovative schools with the curriculum coordinator on the following dimensions:

1. Area Compatibility
2. Interchange Compatibility
3. Aggregate Reciprocal Compatibility

Area compatibility is a general index composed of the total Interchange, Originator, and Reciprocal compatibility indices. This index gives a broad indication of how well two people will mutually satisfy each other's interpersonal needs.

Interchange compatibility refers to the degree of satisfaction of mutually shared needs. A highly compatible group on the Interchange dimension would have similar needs in the wanted and expressed areas of Inclusion, Control, and Affection. Schutz (1958)

points out that this compatibility index is more meaningful in group rather than dyadic interactions as it is the degree of Interchange compatibility in each of the need areas that sets the atmosphere of the group.

The degree to which the expressed needs of one individual meet the wanted needs of another is represented by the Reciprocal Compatibility index. As in each of the other compatibility indices, a sum of two individual's needs area compatibilities represent the aggregate compatibility.

The results seemed to suggest that a relationship existed between innovative/non-innovative principal-curriculum coordinator compatibility with regard to the following:

1. Aggregate Originator Compatibility
2. Originator Control Compatibility
3. Reciprocal Control Compatibility

The aggregate Originator compatibility index is a measure of two individuals' complementary needs satisfaction. By combining one's expressed and wanted needs and comparing them with another's, an indication of the degree to which one's desire to originate action is complemented by another's wish to receive such action is established. The aggregate measure is the sum of complementary need area compatibilities on the Inclusion, Control and Affection dimensions.

In the area of Originator Control Compatibility, an individual with high expressed control needs is most likely to be compatible with

one with low needs in this area.

Reciprocal Control Compatibility is the degree to which one's expressed control needs are satisfied by another's wanted needs on that dimension.

The results of the data analysis seem to underline Schutz's (1958) contention that Area Compatibility is merely a rough measure of the quality of a dyadic or group relationship that leads to mutual satisfaction of interpersonal needs and a harmonious coexistence.

Schutz suggests a weighting of the three components of Area Compatibility according to the importance of each at the particular period of development of a group or dyad to provide a more accurate area compatibility index. That suggestion was not followed in this study as the stage of development of the principal-curriculum coordinator relationship could not be ascertained.

Schutz's (1958) assertion that Interchange Compatibility may be more important for groups greater than two seems to be supported by the findings. Interchange Compatibility refers to a similarity of needs, orientation between individuals or between an individual and a group. Schutz asserts that is is compatibility in the Interchange Area that sets the atmosphere of the group. More relevant to dyadic relationships are Originator and Reciprocal compatibilities.

In the area of Inclusion, Originator compatibility refers to complementary behavior between an individual who expresses his needs by joining or initiating interpersonal activities and the individual who wants to be invited to join these activities.

Originator Control compatibility is the degree to which behavior is complementary in the range of always dominating and controlling other's actions and resisting their influence to never being influential and always being influenced.

On the Originator Affection dimension, compatibility is found in the balance of an individual's need to love rather than be loved with another's desire to be loved rather than love.

Schutz (1958) points out that conflict arises in the area of Originator compatibility when both members of the dyad prefer to initiate action. That is termed "competitive originator incompatibility" (p. 109). "Apathetic originator incompatibility" (p. 109) is in evidence when both members of the dyad prefer to receive action.

In the area of Originator compatibility, competitive incompatibility may be exemplified by a power struggle between two individuals: both of whom want to be dominant and do not want to be told what to do. Apathetic incompatibility is illustrated by a situation where two people discuss what they want to do, but neither takes the initiative to do it.

It should be remembered that the closer the compatibility index approaches zero, the more compatible the dyad.

The high expressed control needs of the innovative principals (Table 1) are reflected in the originator control compatibility index (Table 2). Here, the innovative principals tend to be more compatible with the curricular coordinators. The compatibility index indicates a tendency for the innovative principal to initiate more action with regard to control oriented activities than the non-innovative principal curriculum coordinator.

The negative, or apathetic, non-innovative principal/curriculum coordinator compatibility indicates a trend away from originating action regarding activities where control and power are central issues. The reason for this is that both parties seem to prefer to be recipients rather than initiators of such action.

The aggregate Originator compatibility index is indicative of a higher degree of compatibility between the non-innovative principal and the curriculum coordinator. The positive index for innovative principal-curriculum coordinator compatibility may be interpreted as a trend toward competitive incompatibility. There seems to be more of a tendency for innovative principals and the curriculum coordinator to initiate action and for the non-innovative principals to receive action. The overall Originator compatibility index also indicates a trend toward competitive incompatibility between innovative principals and the curriculum coordinator as both want to initiate action. There appears to be more of a balance along the originate-receive continuum between non-innovative principals and the curriculum coordinator, for the

compatibility index indicates that the principal prefers to be on the receiving end of the action.

The expression of high control needs by innovative principals is again in evidence in the Reciprocal Control compatibility index (Table 3). The trend towards greater compatibility between the innovative principal and the curriculum coordinator on this dimension may be interpreted to mean that the curriculum coordinator's needs for control are met by the innovative principal. In the school setting, this may mean that the innovative principal's need for power over his particular situation is in concert with the curriculum coordinator's need of wanting to be told about what is to take place in the school rather than having to exercise direct control over what takes place.

The lower expressed control needs of the non-innovative principals seem to provide a basis for a less compatible relationship in reference to reciprocal control compatibility with the curriculum coordinator. It may be interpreted that the non-innovative principal's needs to be controlled are not met by the curriculum coordinator, as both seem to want control rather than express control.

Although statistically significant differences were found between innovative principal-curriculum coordinator and non-innovative principal-curriculum coordinator compatibility on the Reciprocal Control, Originator Control, and Aggregate Originator dimensions - these findings should not be interpreted to mean that

large incompatibilities existed between principals and the curriculum coordinator. In all cases, both innovative and non-innovative principals were relatively compatible with the curriculum coordinator. However, the data suggest opposite trends between innovative principal-curriculum coordinator and non-innovative principal-curriculum coordinator compatibilities on the aggregate Originator Control and Reciprocal Control dimensions.

These findings lend support to Erstadt's (1964) conclusion that compatibilities in the control area are critical to any relationship. Erstadt (1964) found that in dyadic relationships between members of highly cohesive groups, compatibility on the control dimension was a salient factor in one member's choice of another for interaction in a variety of situations. He also concluded that the various compatibility indices would be used as accurate dyadic behavioral predictors.

As a positive relationship has been established between compatibility and productivity (Schutz, 1958; Moos and Speisman, 1962; Hutcherson, 1963; Churukian, 1970), the results of this study seem to lend support to the notion that a more productive relationship exists between the curriculum coordinator and the innovative principal than between the curriculum coordinator and the non-innovative principal. Productivity, in this study may be interpreted as attempting and implementing innovative activities in the school as measured by the School Activities Survey.

Perhaps a contributing factor to a productive relationship between the innovative principal and the curriculum coordinator is

the principal's high need to express control. With reference to Originator control and Reciprocal control compatibilities, the need to control seems to give the innovative principal an impetus for action and productivity that is undisturbed by the curriculum coordinator.

The orientation toward apathetic Originator incompatibility and the reciprocal Control compatibility index for the non-innovative principal-curriculum coordinator dyad suggests the absence of an action impetus and, therefore, lower productivity in the relationship.

The consideration of the differences between innovative/non-innovative principal-curriculum coordinator compatibilities suggests that one factor that may contribute to innovative success is the principal's need to express control.

Thus, a possible theory that is suggested by the data is that it is the need to control that provides the impetus for principal to innovate and that the absence of such a need contributes to a lack of innovation or innovative failure.

The importance of this study rests in two areas. First, an attempt has been made to provide a quantifiable means for selecting schools that are successful in adopting educational innovations. It would seem that once innovative and non-innovative schools have been classified, a variety of variables might be studied to ascertain why some schools are successful in innovation adoption and others are not. In a second area of interpersonal compatibility, the findings

of this study may have some ramifications for the selection of principals. An indication of high expressed control needs on the part of innovative principals suggests that a school district in search of people with the potential for bringing about innovative success might want to consider principalship candidates with high interpersonal needs in this area and test further for compatibility with the curriculum coordinator on Originator and Reciprocal Control dimensions. The findings also suggest that the innovative principal will be more effective if he is permitted to function in an autonomous atmosphere so that he, rather than the curriculum coordinator, may initiate action in his school.

REFERENCES

Churukian, G. A. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between the Compatibility of Supervisor-Supervisee Interpersonal Needs and the Quality of Their Interpersonal Relations and Productivity of Supervision." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1970.

Erstadt, B. K. "Interpersonal Compatibility and Intra-Group Choices." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1964.

Gassner, S. "The Relationship Between Patient-Therapist Compatibility and Treatment Effectiveness." Unpublished doctoral disseration, Syracuse University, 1968.

Hutcherson, D., Jr. "Relationship Among Teacher-Pupil Compatibility, Social Studies Grades, and Selected Factors." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1963.

Miles, M. B. Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964.

Moos, R. and Speisman, J. "Group Compatibility and Productivity." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, LXV, 190-196.

Sapolsky, A. "Relationship Between Patient-Doctor Compatibility, Mutual Perception, Outcomes of Treatment." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1965, LXX (February), 70-76.

Schutz, W. C. The FIRO Scales (Manual). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1967.

Schutz, W. C. The Interpersonal Underworld: FIRO. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1958.

Wittes, S. People and Power. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge of the Institute of Social Research, 1970.